DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 263 EC 162 167

AUTHOR	Grosenick, Judith K.; Huntze, Sharon L.
TITLE	Nebraska Training Needs Analysis for Behaviorally Impaired: Administrators' Perception.
INSTITUTION	Nebraska Univ., Lincoln. Dept. of Special Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Nebraska State Dept. of Education, Lincoln. Special Education Section.
PUB DATE	Jun 83
NOTE	44p.; For teachers' perceptions of training needs, see EC 162 166. For other related documents, see EC 162 159-165 and EC 162 168.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; *Behavior Disorders; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Needs Assessment; State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Nebraska

ABSTRACT

Nebraska administrators responded to a survey to identify needs in inservice training of teachers of behaviorally impaired students. A shortened version of the Professional Development Needs Survey was completed by 166 administrators (principals and special education directors) responsible for supervising programs in behavior impairment. When given a list of 21 content/skill topics, administrators indicated individual counseling strategies and behavior management strategies as the top two. Ss further reported that there was a need for in depth (multiple content) work on priority areas. In terms of formats, Ss ranked "hands on," salary credit, and supervisory support as being most desirable and effective, while early bird sessions, weekend offerings, and panel discussions ranked lowest. Compared to the results of an earlier teachers' needs assessment, administrators' ranking of topics were similar except for coping with job related stress, which teachers ranked more highly. Consistency was found in ranking for high and low priority formats. Recommendations for content priorities, level of assistance, formats, and administrator inservice training conclude the report. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EC162167

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Judith K. Grasswick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FINAL REPORT

NEBRASKA TRAINING NEEDS ANALYSIS FOR BEHAVIORALLY IMPAIRED: ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTION

Developed by: Judith K. Grosenick
Sharon L. Huntze

JUNE 1983

National Needs Analysis Project in Behavior Disorders
Department of Special Education
University of Missouri-Columbia
Columbia, Missouri

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The activity which is the subject of this report was made possible because of support from several sources including: (a) the Training Needs Analysis of Administrators Project, Nebraska Comprehensive Systems of Personnel Development (CSPD) of the Nebraska Department of Education; (b) the project on Leadership Inservice Training/National Needs Analysis in Behavior Disorders, Grant No. G008101817 (Project No. 029CH10301) from the Division of Personnel Preparation, Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education; (c) the Support System Project for Behaviorally Impaired, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and (d) the Special Education Branch of the Nebraska Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the opinion or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln or the Nebraska Department of Education. No official endorsement by these agencies should be inferred.

The fulfillment of an activity such as this requires the time, effort, and expertise of numerous individuals. Appreciation is extended to the following individuals whose input significantly shaped the form of this document: Ms. Adria Bace, Ms. Mary Ann Losh, Dr. Reece Peterson, Mr. Jon Rosell, Mrs. Barbara Ross, Mr. Richard Wehland, and Mr. Stanley Wilke.

Judith K. Grosenick, Professor
and Project Director

Sharon L. Huntze, Assistant Professor
and Project Coordinator

Project on Leadership Inservice Training/
National Needs Analysis in Behavior Disorders
Department of Special Education
College of Education
University of Missouri-Columbia
Columbia, Missouri 65211

FINAL REPORT

NEBRASKA TRAINING NEEDS ANALYSIS FOR BEHAVIORALLY IMPAIRED: ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS

INTRODUCTION

Background

Beginning in 1981, the project on Leadership Inservice Training/National Needs Analysis in Behavior Disorders, University of Missouri-Columbia; the Support System Project for Behaviorally Impaired, University of Nebraska-Lincoln; and the Special Education Branch of the Nebraska Department of Education launched a two year project to investigate the inservice training needs of educators serving behaviorally impaired children and youth. This effort was the result of mutual concerns regarding (a) the staggering numbers of unserved children who are disordered by virtue of their behavior, (b) the almost equally shattering teacher shortages besetting the field of behavior disorders, (c) the noticeable lack of inservice specific to behavior impairment available to professionals in the field, and (d) the overwhelming disenchantment with much of the inservice that is currently being provided.

These concerns were coupled with the desire to forge ahead in Nebraska with the implementation of a comprehensive system of personnel development (CSPD), as mandated under Public Law 94-142. Thus, the project on "Nebraska Training Needs Analysis for Behaviorally Impaired" was designed as a two-phase effort to approach the provision of inservice in a systematic manner by providing decision makers with a data base upon which to fashion inservice priorities and directions. In addition, it is hoped that the experience gleaned as a result of implementing this process within one specific area of handicapping condition will prove helpful to other professionals as they contemplate use of similar activities within other areas of handicapping conditions and/or

with different target populations.

Purpose

As indicated previously, the project on "Nebraska Training Needs Analysis for Behaviorally Impaired" is a two-phase project focusing on a systematic approach to inservice needs assessment in the area of behaviorally impaired (BI) in the state of Nebraska. Phase I which was conducted during 1981-82 involved assessing and analyzing the perceptions of inservice needs held by teachers providing direct service to behaviorally impaired children and youth. The results of that effort were published and disseminated in 1982 in a final report entitled Behaviorally Impaired Children in Nebraska: Training Needs Analysis.

Phase II, implemented during 1982-83, involves the perceptions of inservice needs associated with the area of behavioral impairments held by school administrators in Nebraska. This report, which summarizes the details of the second phase of operations, has as its specific purposes to:

1. Describe the procedures employed in the design and implementation of Phase II of a statewide inservice needs assessment in the area of behavioral impairment;
2. Present the data and accompanying analysis which constitute the results of the aforementioned needs assessment;
3. Compare and contrast the data gathered as part of Phase I, teachers' perceptions, with that of Phase II, administrators' perceptions; and
4. Offer a series of recommendations relative to future directions of inservice in behavioral impairments in the state of Nebraska drawn from the results of the Phase II needs assessment.

Audience

Given the nature of the activities described and the purposes of this report, it is expected that the information presented herein will have most relevance for professionals in the Nebraska Department of Education and other

state agencies which provide services to BI children and youth as a guide in the design of future efforts in inservice training. For that same reason, it should also be of value to teacher training personnel at institutions of higher education and other inservice providers responsible for faculty/staff development. In addition, other professionals, including administrators, teachers and support staff who may have input into the nature of inservice in their building, district or educational unit, may also be interested in the report's results.

PROCEDURES

The activities comprising Phase II of the "Nebraska Training Needs Analysis for Behaviorally Impaired" project spanned approximately seven months from planning through completion of the final report. It should be noted, however, that the conceptualization of a two-step approach to needs assessment actually evolved during the first year (1981-82) of the project. For purposes of this report, however, the activities included herein are confined to those which occurred in 1982-83. These have been organized and presented by function, e.g., planning and data collection.

Planning

As indicated previously, the development and implementation of the "Nebraska Training Needs Analysis for Behaviorally Impaired" project represented a collaborative effort involving the Leadership Inservice Training/National Needs Analysis Project, University of Missouri-Columbia; the Support System Project for Behaviorally Impaired, University of Nebraska-Lincoln; and the Special Education Branch, Nebraska Department of Education. The rationale behind each group's participation was described fully in the final report for Phase I and, hence, will not be reiterated here. Persons interested in the details of the first phase of the project are encouraged to obtain a copy of that report.

The vehicle utilized to design and implement the activities comprising the "Nebraska Training Needs Analysis for Behaviorally Impaired" project was a cadre of eight professionals including one public school teacher of the behaviorally impaired, one representative each from an intermediate education unit and corrections as well as individuals affiliated with the Leadership Inservice Training/National Needs Analysis Project, the Support System Project for the Behaviorally Impaired and the Nebraska Department of Education. This

group met periodically across the entirety of the project including 1982-83 with the express purpose of detailing the overall nature and sequence of activities encompassing a two-phase statewide inservice needs assessment in BI. Specific decisions determined by this group for both Phase I and Phase II included: (a) the general content and structure of the needs assessment survey instrument, (b) the target populations to be surveyed, (c) the timelines for the data collection and analysis phases and (d) the roles and responsibilities of the planning committee members in relation to the various needs assessment activities.

Data Collection

Instrumentation. The instrument used to gather information for Phase II of the "Nebraska Training Needs Analysis for the Behaviorally Impaired" was a shortened version of the Professional Development Needs Survey which was utilized during Phase I. The Phase II version was abbreviated by including only those items rated of significant import (positive or negative) by the previous year's respondents. The adapted instrument was two pages in length and was divided into three major subcomponents (please see Appendix A for a copy of the needs assessment survey).

In the first section, the intent was to elicit information related to inservice topics. To this end, the survey asked school administrators to indicate their perception of the needs of their BI and resource teachers relative to (a) specific inservice topics, and (b) the amount of inservice necessary in relation to a specific topic. It should be noted that the respondents were reflecting their perceptions of the inservice needs of their BI and resource teachers, not their own inservice needs. This information was sought so a comparison could be made with Phase I data which elicited inservice needs as perceived by the BI and resource teachers directly. In effect, the two phases

allowed for an assessment of congruence of perceptions held by the two target groups. It was felt that such information would be helpful in evaluating the decision-making process utilized in most systems relative to the content and nature of inservice offered to faculty/staff.

In gathering the information relative to the content of inservice, respondents were provided with a list of 21 topics. This was shortened from the Phase I list of 30. Topics excluded from the administrators' survey included those academic content areas and personal variables (e.g., creativity, assertiveness) in which little or no interest had been expressed by the BI and resource teachers in their survey. The final list of topics, therefore, included 15 knowledge-based areas such as program entry/exit decisions, parent involvement, individual management strategies, discipline, etc.; and six areas which were more personal in nature, e.g., coping with stress, using humor, etc.

To assess need for inservice relative to this content, respondents were asked to rate each of the 21 topics on a five point scale (1=low priority, 5=highest). Preferences regarding the amount of assistance needed for each topic were ascertained by asking respondents to select from two options: "one time contact" or "multiple contacts". Thus, for each of the 21 inservice topics, administrators selected that amount of assistance which they perceived their BI and resource teachers would need.

The second major subcomponent of the Professional Development Needs Survey for Serving Behaviorally Impaired Students focused upon potential format for the delivery of inservice. Traditionally, this is a variable which has received less attention in the assessment of inservice needs. Two types of information relative to inservice format were investigated: desirability and effectiveness. In both instances, respondents were provided with a list of 20 different inservice formats to which to respond. These formats included

options such as observations of other teachers, conferences and workshops, summer seminars, supervisory support, etc. While any such list will never be all inclusive, it was felt that the options presented went beyond the more commonly utilized formats and provided respondents with sufficient, albeit not unlimited, diversity. The format list provided Phase II respondents omitted five items to which Phase I respondents had indicated no strong preference either negatively or positively.

Given this shortened list of 20 formats, administrators were asked to rate each format on a five point scale (1=lowest, 5=highest) first in terms of desirability as an inservice format and then with regard to effectiveness as an inservice format. Again, it is to be noted that the administrators were rating their perceptions of the format preferences of their BI and resource room teachers.

The third and final section of the survey encompassed a brief potpourri of "other" questions. These included: (a) demographic information, (b) estimates of the number of and satisfaction with previous inservice attended by BI and resource teachers and administrators, and (c) administrators' choices of in-services topics and formats to meet their own inservice needs.

Target Population. The target population for Phase II of the "Nebraska Training Needs Analysis for Behaviorally Impaired" project was administrators in Nebraska who were responsible for supervising programs in behavior impairment. A total of 360 surveys were distributed to administrators throughout Nebraska. Of this, 166 (46%) were returned. Given that the survey was mailed to the entire population as defined, the return rate was well beyond that level necessary to be considered statistically significant.

Based on the return data, the administrator population was comprised of three subgroups: (a) principals (n=105), (b) special education directors (n=37)

and (c) other (n=24). Thus, of the total 166 respondents, the proportionate representation of each group was 63%, 22% and 15% respectively. The "other" category consisted of a variety of BI related personnel. The actual mailing list for the Phase II target population was developed through the combined efforts of the Support System Project for Behaviorally Impaired and the Special Education Branch, Nebraska Department of Education.

Timelines. The final draft of the Phase II needs assessment survey was completed by January, 1983. Distribution to the target population occurred during February and March. Data collection was terminated as of mid-April.

SURVEY RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The Professional Development Needs Survey for Serving Behaviorally Impaired Students was composed of three major sections. Section I was concerned with content and/or skill areas that might be considered as topics for inservice efforts. Respondents were asked to provide two types of data relative to these content/skill areas: (1) the need they felt that BI and resource teachers had for assistance in this area; and (2) the amount of assistance they felt would be most beneficial to those persons. Section II concerned the manner in which inservice can be made available. Respondents were asked to rate both the desirability and effectiveness of a range of inservice formats for BI and resource teachers. Finally, Section III tapped a variety of data including: job description, previous inservice involvement of BI and resource teachers, and personal need for inservice (both content and format). The survey is reproduced in its entirety in Appendix A. The data from each of the sections listed above will be presented with an accompanying analysis of the data.

For some questions, it was determined to compare the means of the total population of respondents against two subgroups of respondents: principals and directors of special education. These two subgroups accounted for 86% of the total responses, and therefore, do not simply reflect component halves of the total group. The additional 15% of respondents in the total population include a variety of other BI related professionals. For other questions, the data simply compares choices of the total respondent group.

Section I - Part A

The variables presented in Section I were a list of 21 content and/or skill descriptors that might serve as inservice topics for BI and/or resource teachers. The first task of the participants was to rank each of those variables

on a scale of 1-5 from low to high priority, respectively. Table 1 compares both the mean rating and the relative ranked order of these variables across all three populations. In Table 2 the content/skill variables have been ranked from highest to lowest in terms of the expressed priorities of the survey participants.

The most significant result of the need priority section of the survey is that all three populations view individual counseling strategies and individual behavior management strategies as the two most important content/skill needs of BI and resource teachers. It is apparent that principals and special education directors, as well as a variety of other BI related professionals feel that an individual counseling and behavioral management strategy is the greatest inservice training need of persons involved in direct service to BI students.

Further comparisons reveal an extremely strong consensus among groups on most topics. Five of the top seven choices are the same for all groups; that is, all respondents, principals and directors, included "individual counseling", "individual management", "consultation with other educators", "social skills/ affective education", and "group management strategies" in their top seven choices (i.e., top one-third of the content/skill options). Considering the range of topics presented for participants' selection, that is unusual consensus. Examination of those five topics also reveals that four of them are clearly strategies concerning behavioral interactions.

Equally interesting is a comparison of the bottom third of the list, i.e., those topics that were felt to be least needed by BI and resource teachers. Once again there is remarkable consistency. Five of the bottom seven are identical: "empathy", "humor", "IEPs", "discipline", and "environmental management". It appears that the respondents are in agreement concerning what

TABLE 1

MEAN RATING AND RANK ORDER OF INSERVICE TOPICS

Content/Skill	All Respondents		Principals		Sp. Ed. Directors	
	$\bar{X}$ Rating	Rank Order	$\bar{X}$ Rating	Rank Order	$\bar{X}$ Rating	Rank Order
Problem Solving	3.28	7	3.26	6	3.22	8
Entry/Exit Decisions	2.89	15	2.76	18	2.97	14
Motivation Techniques	3.38	4.5	3.46	3	3.17	9
IEPs	2.73	19	2.80	17	2.54	21
Parent Involvement	3.25	9	3.12	8.5	3.49	5
*Vocational/Career	3.27	8	3.09	10	3.65	3
Social Skills	3.38	4.5	3.27	5	3.49	5
Individual Management	3.55	2	3.50	2	3.68	2
Individual Counseling	3.60	1	3.51	1	3.81	1
Group Management	3.33	6	3.19	7	3.49	5
Environmental Mgt.	2.67	21	2.51	20.5	2.86	18.5
Coping with Stress	3.12	11	3.12	8.5	3.16	10.5
Consultation	3.39	3	3.32	4	3.43	7
Flexibility	2.94	14	2.90	14	3.05	13
Discipline	2.68	20	2.51	20.5	2.95	15
Self Concept	2.96	13	2.95	13	2.92	16.5
Mainstreaming	3.07	12	3.08	11	2.92	16.5
Humor	2.82	17	2.84	16	2.86	18.5
Agency Roles/Functions	3.17	10	3.07	12	3.16	10.5
Residential Treatment	2.79	18	2.62	19	3.06	12
Empathy	2.86	16	2.89	15	2.70	20

*Statistically significant means for principals and directors

TABLE 2

RANK ORDER OF INSERVICE TOPICS BY MEAN RATING

All Respondents		Principals		Directors of Special Education	
Content/Skill	$\bar{X}$ Rating	Content/Skill	$\bar{X}$ Rating	Content/Skill	$\bar{X}$ Rating
Individual Counseling	3.60	Individual Counseling	3.51	Individual Counseling	3.81
Individual Mgt.	3.55	Individual Mgt.	3.50	Individual Mgt.	3.68
Consultation	3.39	Motivation Tech.	3.46	Vocational/Career**	3.65
Motivation Tech.	3.38	Consultation	3.32	Parent Involvement	3.49
Social Skills	3.38	Social Skills	3.27	Social Skills	3.49
Group Management	3.33	Problem Solving*	3.26	Group Management	3.49
Problem Solving*	3.28	Group Management	3.18	Consultation	3.43
Vocational/Career**	3.27	Parent Involvement	3.12	Problem Solving*	3.22
Parent Involvement	3.25	Coping with Stress*	3.12	Motivation Tech.	3.17
Agency Roles/ Function	3.17	Vocational/Career**	3.09	Coping with Stress*	3.16
Coping with Stress*	3.12	Mainstreaming	3.08	Agency Roles/ Function	3.16
Mainstreaming	3.07	Agency Roles/ Function	3.07	Residential Treatment	3.06
Self-Concept*	2.96	Self-Concept*	2.95	Flexibility*	3.05
Flexibility*	2.94	Flexibility*	2.90	Entry/Exit	2.97
Entry/Exit	2.89	Empathy*	2.89	Discipline	2.95
Empathy*	2.86	Humor*	2.84	Self-Concept*	2.92
Humor*	2.82	IEPs	2.80	Mainstreaming	2.92
Residential Treatment	2.79	Entry/Exit	2.76	Environment Mgt.	2.86
IEPs	2.73	Residential Treatment	2.62	Humor*	2.86
Discipline	2.68	Environment Mgt.	2.51	Empathy*	2.70
Environment Mgt.	2.67	Discipline	2.51	IEPs	2.54

*Topics categorized as "Personal Variables" as opposed to "Skill Variables"
**Statistically significant means for principals and directors

BI and resource teachers do not need as well as what they do need.

Another way to consider the data is to examine ranked positions that are highly discrepant. Given a list of 21 topics, a discrepancy of seven rank positions (therefore, one-third of the items) would appear noteworthy. There are only two such items: "vocational/career education" and "residential treatment alternative". The former varies seven positions between principals and directors. T-tests run on the discrepancies between means of principals and directors of special education also reveal this to be a statistically significant variation. The latter item, that of "residential treatment alternatives", also varies seven ranked positions between principals and directors of special education. The principal/director T-test comparison shows that while the statistical difference is not significant, it nears significance. It is not surprising that discrepancies occur on these two topics.

Vocational/career education, while of concern to special educators, both direct service providers and directors of special education, is a lesser priority to principals. Since the area of vocational/career education has received so much attention of late in the programming for all handicapped students, it comes as no surprise to see special educators expressing a need for more inservice on the topic. The principals' ranking of the vocational/career variable may be influenced by the responses of elementary school principals. Administrators at this level may see less of a need for providing such service to their students (nonhandicapped as well as handicapped) and, thus, perceive less need for inservice in this area.

With regard to residential placement alternatives, the details for such are generally "worked out" at an administrative level beyond the individual's school building once such a program decision has been made. In fact, it is often the case that administrative approval must be gained <u>prior</u> to any such decision. Thus, it is more of a concern at the administrative level beyond the

school building. In other words, the great concern of directors with this topic is probably a function of job description.

One final way to analyze the data on the priorities of inservice topics is to look at what has been called "personal variables" vs. "content variables". While most of the inservice topics deal with knowledge acquisition, i.e., content variables, some deal with topics concerning personality. These were labeled personal variables. There are six personal variables within the list of 21 topics: "problem solving", "coping with stress", "flexibility", "self-concept", "humor", and "empathy". Analysis of the distribution of these variables finds them scattered across the entire topic list. That is, as a group, these variables are not seen as being a high priority or a low one. Rather, some are considered high (one occurs in the top seven), some are low priorities (two occur in the bottom seven), and some fall in the middle ranks.

Section I - Part B

The second task of the respondents relative to the 21 possible inservice topics was to indicate the amount of assistance they felt was required by BI and resource teachers on the topic. The two amounts of assistance options were one time contact and multiple contacts. Table 3 displays the percentage of all respondents selecting each of the assistance options for each inservice topic. For 12 of the 21 topics, respondents felt that BI and resource teachers needed one time assistance. For 8 of the topics, respondents felt that BI and resource teachers needed multiple contacts (one item was evenly split, i.e., 50% in favor of one time contact and 50% in favor of multiple contact).

A comparison of Table 3 with Table 2 and its accompanying narrative reveals that of the five high priority topics on which there was agreement across groups of respondents, four were also selected as ones which required multiple contacts. The fifth topic was the evenly split item. Thus, it is clear that

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS' PREFERENCES RELATIVE TO AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE OPTIONS BY CONTENT/SKILL TOPIC

Content/Skill	All Respondents	
	One	Multiple
*Problem Solving	42	58
Entry/Exit Decisions	68	32
Motivation Techniques	48	52
IEPs	70	30
Parent Involvement	57	43
Vocational/Career	47	53
Social Skills	50	50
Individual Management	37	63
Individual Counseling	36	65
Group Management	40	60
Environmental Mgt.	72	28
*Coping with Stress	42	58
Consultation	43	57
*Flexibility	57	43
Discipline	78	22
*Self-Concept	61	39
Mainstreaming	60	40
*Humor	71	29
Agency Roles/Functions	65	35
Residential Treatment	78	22
*Empathy	60	40

*Personal variables

respondents feel strongly about the need for indepth work on the priority content/skill areas. Conversely, the five low priority topics which were consistent across groups were among those selected for one time contact; and were so selected with high percentages (60%-78%). It would appear clear that for topics selected as high priority, respondents feel that BI and resource teachers would benefit from sustained effort inservice.

Finally, there appears to be no strong difference between "content variables" and "personal variables". Of the six "personal variables" on the topic list, four were preferred as one time contacts (67%) and two were preferred as multiple contacts (33%). Of the 15 "content variables" on the topic list, eight were preferred as single contacts (53%), six were preferred as multiple contacts (40%) and one was evenly split (7%). While the results are too equivocal for sure generalization, it may be that there is some recognition that inservice on "personal variables" requires more sustained contact than inservice on knowledge or "content" variables.

Section II - Part A

The first half of Section II required the respondents to rank a list of 20 possible formats for continued professional development in terms of the format's desirability for their BI and resource teachers. The mean rating of each format across all three populations is presented in Table 4. Table 5 arranges those means in ranked order from most to least desirable. The results of these ranked orders again show considerable consistency. Six of the top seven (roughly top one-third) desired formats are identical for all three respondent groups. Although the order varies within each group, all three populations preferred the same types of formats. Thus, it is very clear that professional development formats which offer salary credit are a top priority of all respondents. Formats that can be described as "hands on", supervisory

TABLE 4

MEAN RATINGS OF DESIRABILITY OF FORMAT FOR ALL POPULATIONS

Format	All Respondents	Principals	Special Education Directors
Observations	3.41	3.40	3.51
Visitations	3.58	3.53	3.69
Weekend Offerings	2.45	2.42	2.47
"Hands On"	4.07	3.97	4.14
Video Tapes	3.05	3.03	3.00
Conf./Workshops	3.69	3.69	3.70
Salary Credit	3.91	4.00	3.75
College Credit	3.70	3.81	3.50
Teacher/Child Exch.	2.60	2.64	2.60
Panel Discussions	2.57	2.58	2.43
Summer Seminars	3.31	3.34	3.25
Reg. Study Groups	3.00	2.98	3.06
Release Time	3.53	3.48	3.70
Prob. Solv. Sessions	3.68	3.65	3.72
Staff/Peer Support	3.73	3.73	3.75
Supervisory Support	3.75	3.76	3.78
"Make & Take"	2.99	2.96	3.06
Brown Bag	2.47	2.47	2.60
Early Bird	2.14	2.14	2.26
Personal Contracts	3.08	3.14	2.94

TABLE 5

RANK ORDER OF DESIRABILITY OF FORMAT FOR ALL POPULATIONS

All Respondents		Principals		Special Education Directors	
Format	$\bar{X}$ Rating	Format	$\bar{X}$ Rating	Format	$\bar{X}$ Rating
"Hands On"	4.07	Salary Credit	4.00	"Hands On"	4.14
Salary Credit	3.91	"Hands On"	3.97	Superv. Support	3.78
Superv. Support	3.75	College Credit	3.81	Salary Credit	3.75
Staff/Peer Support	3.73	Superv. Support	3.76	Staff/Peer Support	3.75
College Credit	3.70	Staff/Peer Support	3.73	Prob. Solv. Sessions	3.72
Conf./Wkshps.	3.69	Conf./Wkshps.	3.69	Conf./Wkshps.	3.70
Prob. Solv. Sessions	3.68	Prob. Solv. Sessions	3.65	Release Time	3.70
Visitations	3.58	Visitations	3.53	Visitations	3.69
Release Time	3.53	Release Time	3.48	Observations	3.51
Observations	3.41	Observations	3.40	College Credit	3.50
Summer Seminars	3.31	Summer Seminars	3.34	Summer Seminars	3.25
Personal Contracts	3.08	Personal Contracts	3.14	Reg. Study Groups	3.06
Video Tapes	3.05	Video Tapes	3.03	"Make & Take"	3.06
Reg. Study Groups	3.00	Reg. Study Groups	2.98	Video Tapes	3.00
"Make & Take"	2.99	"Make & Take"	2.96	Personal Contracts	2.94
Tchr/Child Exchange	2.60	Tchr/Child Exchange	2.64	Tchr/Child Exchange	2.60
Panel Discussions	2.57	Panel Discussions	2.58	Brown Bag	2.60
Brown Bag	2.47	Brown Bag	2.47	Weekend Offerings	2.47
Weekend Offerings	2.45	Weekend Offerings	2.42	Panel Discussions	2.43
Early Bird	2.14	Early Bird	2.14	Early Bird	2.20

support, staff/peer support, conference/workshops and problems solving sessions are those which respondents are most desirous of for BI and resource teachers. The single difference in this top seven group is, perhaps, an interesting one. While principals included "college credit" high on their list (rank order 3), directors ranked it at 10, a discrepancy of over one-third of the rank order places. Directors, on the other hand put "release time" in rank seven of the top seven. While this item did not make the top seven of the principals' list, it was ranked number 9, a small discrepancy. Clearly, the perception of the value of "college credit" is different for those who supervise direct service personnel in building (principals) than for those who supervise and organize programs across several environments (directors of special education).

Equally clear is the consensus on least desired formats. Five of the last seven choices for all populations were identical although the order varied for each group. It is readily apparent that teacher/child exchange, panel discussions, brown-bag sessions, weekend offerings, and early bird sessions are not considered desirable formats for inservice offerings.

Section II - Part B

The second task of Section II asked the administrators to rate the effectiveness of the formats for BI and resource teachers. Table 6 displays the mean rating for the perceived effectiveness of each format. Table 7 ranks those formats from high to low for all three populations. Again, there is incredible similarity. The first choice is the same across all groups. Six of the top seven choices for each group are identical, making it clear which formats are considered least effective.

It is not surprising that there is a high correlation between those formats that respondents perceived as desirable (Tables 4 and 5) and those they perceived as effective. Presumably respondents do not desire to participate in ineffective

TABLE 6

MEAN RATINGS OF EFFECTIVENESS OF
FORMAT FOR ALL POPULATIONS

Format	All Respondents	Principals	Special Education Directors
Observations	3.42	3.41	3.41
Visitations	3.54	3.52	3.55
Weekend Offerings	2.54	2.50	2.63
"Hands On"	4.08	3.96	4.23
Video Tapes	3.02	2.99	3.06
Conf./Workshops	3.63	3.63	3.63
Salary Credit	3.76	3.87	3.60
College Credit	3.52	3.63	3.31
Teacher/Child Exchanges	2.61	2.60	2.80
Panel Discussions	2.52	2.54	2.37
Summer Seminars	3.39	3.43	3.32
Reg. Study Groups	3.05	2.99	3.23
Release Time	3.38	3.47	3.25
Problem Solving Sessions	3.63	3.60	3.68
Staff/Peer Support	3.77	3.79	3.75
Supervisory Support	3.74	3.74	3.66
"Make & Take"	3.00	2.99	3.10
Brown Bag	2.53	2.53	2.68
Early Bird	2.30	2.35	2.35
Personal Contracts	3.25	3.26	3.16

TABLE 7

RANK ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS OF FORMAT
FOR ALL POPULATIONS

All Respondents		Principals		Special Education Directors	
Format	$\bar{X}$ Rating	Format	$\bar{X}$ Rating	Format	$\bar{X}$ Rating
"Hands On"	4.08	"Hands On"	3.96	"Hands On"	4.23
Staff/Peer Support	3.77	Salary Credit	3.87	Staff/Peer Support	3.75
Salary Credit	3.76	Staff/Peer Support	3.79	Prob. Solv. Session	3.68
Superv. Support	3.74	Superv. Support	3.74	Superv. Support	3.66
Conf./Wkshps.	3.63	Conf./Wkshps.	3.63	Conf./Wkshps.	3.63
Prob. Solv. Session	3.63	College Credit	3.63	Salary Credit	3.60
Visitations	3.54	Prob. Solv. Session	3.60	Visitations	3.55
College Credit	3.52	Visitations	3.52	Observations	3.41
Observations	3.42	Release Time	3.47	Summer Seminars	3.32
Release Time	3.38	Summer Seminars	3.43	College Credit	3.31
Summer Seminars	3.39	Observations	3.41	Release Time	3.25
Personal Contracts	3.23	Personal Contracts	3.26	Reg. Study Groups	3.23
Reg. Study Groups	3.05	Video Tapes	2.99	Personal Contracts	3.16
Video Tapes	3.02	Reg. Study Groups	2.99	"Make & Take"	3.10
"Make & Take"	3.00	"Make & Take"	2.99	Video Tapes	3.06
Tchr/Child Exchange	2.61	Tchr/Child Exchange	2.60	Tchr/Child Exchange	2.80
Weekend Offerings	2.54	Panel Discussions	2.54	Brown Bag	2.68
Brown Bag	2.53	Brown Bag	2.53	Weekend Offerings	2.63
Panel Discussions	2.52	Weekend Offerings	2.50	Panel Discussions	2.37
Early Bird	2.30	Early Bird	2.35	Early Bird	2.35

formats. This comparison is presented in Table 8. The top seven (highest priorities) and the bottom seven (lowest priorities) of both desirability and effectiveness of formats are presented. The comparisons are as straightforward as any survey could hope to produce. When comparing desirability and effectiveness of formats the following is clear:

For All Respondents

High Choice Comparisons - Six out of seven are the same
Low Choice Comparisons - Six out of seven are the same

For Principals

High Choice Comparisons - All seven are the same
Low Choice Comparisons - All seven are the same

Directors of Special Education

High Choice Comparisons - Six out of seven are the same
Low Choice Comparisons - Six out of seven are the same

The manner in which all participants choose to receive their continued professional development as well as the manner in which they choose not to receive it is readily apparent.

Section III

This section was comprised of four questions. Question one, demographic data was reviewed in the introductory section of this report. Question two was "thrown out" due to the inordinately large number of missing cases. Of the total 166 respondents, the range of missing cases on the six subparts of this question was from 81-102. These numbers constitute far too large a portion of the sample to legitimately draw conclusions from the responses given. Question three and four are considered below.

Administrator inservice needs. Respondents were asked to consider which of the inservice topics they most needed assistance on. They were asked to select from the topics in Section I the first, second and third most important need areas for themselves. The topics they selected are listed in Table 9

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF RANK ORDER OF DESIRABILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF FORMAT FOR ALL POPULATIONS

All Respondents		Principals		Directors of Special Education	
Desirable	Effective	Desirable	Effective	Desirable	Effective
"Hands On"	"Hands On"	Salary Credit	"Hands On"	"Hands On"	"Hands On"
Salary Credit	Staff/Peer Support	"Hands On"	Salary Credit	Superv. Supp.	Staff/Peer Support
Superv. Supp.	Salary Credit	College Credit	Staff/Peer Support	Salary Credit	Prob. Solv. Sessions
Staff/Peer Support	Superv. Supp.	Superv. Supp.	Superv. Supp.	Staff/Peer Support	Superv. Supp.
College Credit	Conf/Wkshps.	Staff/Peer Support	Conf/Wkshps.	Prob. Solv. Sessions	Conf/Wkshps.
Conf/Wkshps.	Prob. Solv. Sessions	Conf/Wkshps.	College Credit	Conf/Wkshps.	Salary Credit
Prob. Solv. Sessions	Visitations	Prob. Solv. Sessions	Prob. Solv. Sessions	Release Time	Visitations
*	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	*
Reg. Study Groups	Video Tapes	Reg. Study Groups	Reg. Study Groups	Video Tapes	"Make & Take"
"Make & Take"	"Make & Take"	"Make & Take"	"Make & Take"	Personal Contracts	Video Tapes
Tchr/Child Exchanges	Tchr/Child Exchanges	Tchr/Child Exchanges	Tchr/Child Exchanges	Tchr/Child Exchanges	Tchr/Child Exchanges
Panel Discussions	Weekend Offerings	Panel Discussions	Panel Discussions	Brown Bag	Brown Bag
Brown Bag	Brown Bag	Brown Bag	Brown Bag	Weekend Offerings	Weekend Offerings
Weekend Offerings	Panel Discussions	Weekend Offerings	Weekend Offerings	Panel Discussions	Panel Discussions
Early Bird	Early Bird	Early Bird	Early Bird	Early Bird	Early Bird

TABLE 9

FREQUENCY AND RANK ORDER OF INSERVICE TOPICS SELECTED BY ADMINISTRATORS
(ALL RESPONDENTS)

Content/Skill	Frequency	Rank Order
Problem Solving	33	4
Entry/Exit Decisions	20	11
Motivation Techniques	37	2
IEPs	21	9.5
Parent Involvement	21	9.5
Vocational/Career	26	6
Social Skills	14	14
Individual Management	48	1
Individual Counseling	35	3
Group Management	24	8
Environmental Management	9	17
Coping with Stress	25	7
Consultation	19	12
Flexibility	4	19.5
Discipline	13	15
Self Concept	8	18
Mainstreaming	29	5
Humor	0	21
Agency Roles/Functions	18	13
Residential Treatment	11	16
Empathy	4	19.5

by frequency of choice with rank order indicated. Table 10 presents that data in ranked order form. The top seven choices are individual management, motivation techniques, individual counseling, problem solving, mainstreaming, vocational/career, and coping with stress. The least needed topics included: humor, flexibility, empathy, self-concept, environmental management, residential treatment, and discipline.

While there are many similarities between the topics administrators selected for themselves and those they selected for teachers, there are a few discrepancies that may be worth noting. Administrators ranked the topics "consultation" and "social skills" education much higher for teachers than for themselves. They also ranked the topics of "mainstreaming" and "coping with job related stress" as greater needs for themselves than for teachers.

Preferred Inservice Formats. Question four examined the type of inservice formats that administrators found most desirable for themselves. Those results are presented in Tables 11 and 12 and are self-explanatory. It is interesting to note, however, that administrators selected for themselves many of the same formats they selected for teachers, although in varied order. However, they generally view staff/peer and supervisory support as less important for themselves than for teachers.

Comparison of Phase I and Phase II Results

It is instructive to compare the priorities for inservice topics that direct service providers selected for themselves in Phase I of the survey to the topics that administrators selected for them in Phase II. The direct service providers were selecting topics for which they felt a need for inservice. In Phase II the administrators were selecting topics on which they felt the direct service providers needed inservice. Since the administrator population often plans and offers inservice to direct service providers, it is

TABLE 10

RANK ORDER OF INSERVICE TOPICS
SELECTED BY ADMINISTRATORS

Order	Content/Skill Area
1	Individual Management
2	Motivation Techniques
3	Individual Counseling
4	Problem Solving
5	Mainstreaming
6	Vocational/Career
7	Coping with Stress
8	Group Management
9	IEPs
10	Parent Involvement
11	Entry/Exit Decisions
12	Consultation
13	Agency Roles/Functions
14	Social Skills
15	Discipline
16	Residential Treatment
17	Environmental Management
18	Self Concept
19	Flexibility
20	Empathy
21	Humor

TABLE 11

FREQUENCY AND RANK ORDER OF
INSERVICE FORMAT SELECTED BY ADMINISTRATORS
(ALL RESPONDENTS)

Format	Frequency	Rank Order
Observations	25	6.5
Visitations	55	2
Weekend Offerings	6	15.5
"Hands On"	47	4
Video Tapes	22	8
Conference/Workshops	64	1
Salary Credit	27	5
College Credit	19	9.5
Teacher/Child Exchanges	3	18.5
Panel Discussions	8	14
Summer Seminars	19	9.5
Regional Study Groups	13	12.5
Release Time	6	15.5
Problem Solving Sessions	50	3
Staff/Peer Support	25	6.5
Supervisory Support	16	11
"Make & Take"	5	17
Brown Bag	0	20
Early Bird	3	18.5
Personal Contracts	13	12.5

TABLE 12

RANK ORDER OF DESIRABILITY OF
INSERVICE FORMATS SELECTED BY ADMINISTRATORS
(ALL RESPONDENTS)

Order	Format
1	Conference/Workshops
2	Visitations
3	Problem Solving Sessions
4	"Hands On"
5	Salary Credit
6	Observations
7	Staff/Peer Support
8	Video Tapes
9	College Credit
10	Summer Seminars
11	Supervisory Support
12	Regional Study Groups
13	Personal Contracts
14	Panel Discussions
15	Weekend Offerings
16	Release Time
17	"Make & Take"
18	Teacher/Child Exchanges
19	Early Bird
20	Brown Bag

useful to know how well the perceptions of these groups matched.

Briefly, the top one-third of the priorities on inservice topics selected by direct service providers is listed below in ranked order:

Social Skills

Coping with Stress

Consultation

Individual Counseling

Group Management

Motivation Techniques

Problem Solving

Individual Management

Agency Roles/Function

Vocational/Career Education

A comparison of the above list with Table 2 reveals the similarity of that list to the top one-third (seven items) of the administrators' list. There is, however, one very notable exception. Despite the overall similarity of the lists, one of the top choices of direct service providers, "coping with job related stress" is not rated nearly as highly among administrators as among direct service persons. Coping with stress was ranked second by teachers but did not even rank in the top one-third of the administrators' list of perceived teacher needs.

The lowest priorities of the direct service providers (the bottom one-third) included:

Self Concept

Residential Treatment

Empathy

IEPs

Entry/Exit Decisions

Discipline

Humor

Environmental Management

Music/Art

P.E.

Comparison of the direct providers low priorities for inservice to those of the administrators reveals that they are very similar. While the order varies somewhat, the bottom third of the direct providers' list includes the same topics listed on the bottom third of the administrators' list.

When addressing the question of the amount of assistance that direct providers felt was required for various inservice topics, direct service providers selected these topics as ones that required multiple contacts:

Problem Solving

Social Skills

Individual Counseling

Coping with Stress

Consultation

The comparison of that list with Table 3 indicates that administrators selected multiple contacts for these topics:

Problem Solving

Motivation Techniques

Vocational/Career

Individual Management

Individual Counseling

Group Management

Coping with Stress

Consultation

This comparison reveals that of the five topics on the direct providers' list, four are included on the administrators' list. The one exception is the topic of "social skills". The administrators' list was expanded to also include "motivational techniques", "vocational/career education" and "individual and group management".

Comparison of inservice format preferences, i.e., what direct service providers do and do not prefer compared to what administrators felt were preferred and non-preferred formats for direct providers, was extremely consistent. The top and bottom third of the direct providers selections are listed below:

High Priority Formats	Low Priority Formats
Salary Credit	"Make & Take"
College Credit	Teacher/Child Exchanges
Visitations	Personal Contracts
"Hands On"	Brown Bag
Supervisory Support	Regional Study Groups
Observations	Weekend Offerings
Staff/Peer Support	Panel Discussions
Conference/Workshops	Early Bird

When compared to Table 5, it is apparent that the format preferences are extremely consistent overall. There is one noticeable discrepancy, however. "College Credit", which ranked high on direct providers' lists and also was in the top third of the all respondents category of administrators, was much lower on the special education directors' list. This discrepancy was noted earlier and, while it is difficult to offer suggestions as to why this is the case, it still must be noted as a point at which directors are not

"in tune" with direct providers' preferences.

Finally, direct providers and administrators both were asked to indicate which formats were most and least effective with direct providers. Administrator results from Table 7 can be compared to direct provider results listed below:

Most Effective Formats	Least Effective Formats
"Hands On"	Retreats
Salary Credit	Weekend Offerings
College Credit	Teacher/Child Exchanges
Visitations	Personal Contracts
Supervisory Support	Regional Study Groups
Staff/Peer Support	Brown Bag
Conference/Workshops	Panel Discussions
Problem Solving Sessions	Early Bird

The most effective choices are very similar, although once again the "college credit" discrepancy is of interest. The least effective format choices are again similar overall, although there is more variation in rank order for those choices.

Generally, then, we find that what direct service providers preferred for themselves in terms of inservice topics, amount of inservice, and formats for inservice is remarkably similar to what administrators felt that direct providers needed and wanted. The only discrepancies of significant enough proportions to warrant attention are those of: (1) coping with stress as an inservice topic and (2) college credit as a desirable and effective inservice format.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Presented herein is a series of recommendations drawn from the array of data generated by the Phase II survey of inservice training needs. Where appropriate, the recommendations also are discussed in relationship to the results of Phase I of the "Nebraska Training Needs Analysis for Behaviorally Impaired". The organization of these recommendations parallels the major parameters of professional development investigated as part of the statewide needs assessment in BI and includes the categories of content priorities, amount of assistance, format and administrator inservice. While the recommendations are subdivided into these categories it is important to recognize that there are interrelationships between and among recommendations across the various categories. Thus, for example, the recommendations regarding content priorities are presented independently; however, their implications must also be considered in light of recommendations under the categories of format and amount of assistance.

Content Priorities

1. It is apparent that inservice related to behavior management strategies and interpersonal interaction forms a set of topics that warrant high priority as inservice for professionals serving behaviorally impaired children and youth. Specific topics for inclusion in such inservice should be: individual counseling, individual management, group management, motivation techniques, consultative skills with other professionals and social skills curriculum/materials. This recommendation is based on several results including: (a) both principals and directors of special education identified these topics as falling within the top one-third

of inservice topics their BI staff needed, and (b) BI and/or resource teachers included part or all of these topics within the top one-third of inservice topics that they themselves needed. Such consistency cannot be ignored. On the other hand, such results are not unpredictable, given the population of students under consideration.

2. While the data are somewhat mixed on the topic, it is also recommended that inservice be made available related to vocational/career education. BI teachers and directors of special education expressed need for more attention to this area by ranking it within the top one-third of the topics needed. This fact, coupled with the dearth of BI students being given access to vocational/career education services, intensifies the priority that this topic should be given.

3. Another topic on which the data are somewhat conflicting is that of coping with job stress. Nevertheless, inservice on that topic is being recommended. While BI and resource teachers rated the need for this topic within the top one-third of their choices, it did not make the top one-third of the administrators' list. It would be unfortunate if this meant that administrators are not aware of the amount of stress teachers are, in fact, feeling. In light of the sizeable attrition and burnout rates encountered in the field of behavior disorders, administrators must be particularly sensitive to the area of job-related stress. Thus, the recommendation for inservice on this topic which was made as a result of Phase I is re-emphasized here.

4. While there may be some hesitancy in offering negative recommendations, it seems that at least for the time being inservice which emphasizes (a) IEPs, (b) environmental management, and (c) discipline needs to be offered (if at all offered) only after the most judicious consideration. This is recommended in light of the consistently low rankings accorded these topics by both Phase I and II respondents. Across all groups surveyed these three topics were ranked in the bottom one-third. While we are cognizant of the implications of something being "on the bottom" in a ranking system, the consistency of the data in this case probably signals that the relative lack of interest and motivation attributed to the aforementioned topics should be attended to when designing future inservice.

Amount of Assistance

1. Given the results of both Phase I and II, it is apparent that a relationship exists between amount of assistance and priority of inservice topic. That is, the highest priority topics for inservice are also those for which multiple contacts are considered necessary. This comes as no surprise particularly in light of previous findings of the National Needs Analysis Project regarding the overwhelming disenchantment with "one-time, two hour spiels". Inservice developers cannot ignore the growing sentiment for providing a more equitable balance in the amount of inservice they provide. This certainly has implications for resource allocations (both human and fiscal) which must be considered in the planning and design of inservice. Nevertheless, the data are becoming

increasingly obvious in their direction: preferred inservice is desired on a more frequent basis.

Format

1. The incredible consistency of the data on format desirability within and between Phase I and II respondents makes it obvious what formats should be considered when designing future professional development activities for professionals in the field of BI. When comparing desirability and effectiveness across all groups responding, the following formats were consistently rated (83%-100% agreement) within the high choice groups on both variables: salary credit, "hands-on" practicum, supervisory support, release time, conferences and workshops, and problem solving sessions. Therefore, it is recommended that these alternatives be given highest priority when designing the delivery of inservice. The strength of data are such that they cannot be ignored.

2. Equally clear-cut are the data regarding formats which are perceived as less desirable and less effective. Again, the data are amazingly consistent (83%-100% agreement) across all groups for Phase I and II on the variables of desirability and effectiveness. Thus, inservice planners would be wise to avoid the use of brown bag sessions, panel discussions, early bird sessions and weekend offerings. Fortunately, the variety of options available on the positive end of the continuum of desirability and effectiveness should not work any undue hardship on those individuals designing inservice with an eye to a variety of formats.

3. One format, college credit, is recommended for consideration as a priority although the data are somewhat mixed. BI and resource teachers ranked college credit as one of the two highest choices in terms of desirability and effectiveness. Principals also ranked this format within the top one-third in terms of perceived desirability and effectiveness for BI and resource teachers. Special education directors, on the other hand, ranked college credit lower (within the middle one-third). Thus, it appears that building level personnel (teachers and principals) place greater value on college credit associated with staff inservice. Because of the relative strength of the ranking of college credit by the three subgroups it is recommended as a preferred format despite the lack of concurrence by directors of special education.

Administrator Inservice

The data regarding administrator preference for inservice and format is abbreviated as compared to their perceptions of teachers' preferences (administrators selected only three inservice topics and three preferred formats). Nevertheless, we have included a limited number of recommendations for consideration by those designing inservice for the administrator population. Certainly, a more fully developed survey would be preferable to gain an indepth picture of administrators' inservice needs in the area of behavioral impairment. From a different perspective, direct service providers need to be alert to the following preferences of their administrators. These may be areas on which additional communication (not necessarily formal inservice) would be helpful and for which they may wish to take the initiative. In

either case, the following represent only a stimulus list for working with administrators relative to behavior impairment.

1. With regard to topics of interest to administrators, inservice providers should give attention to the following: individual management, motivation techniques, individual counseling, problem solving, mainstreaming, vocational/career, and coping with stress. These represent administrators' top seven choices for their own inservices. In addition, several of these are congruent with the topics which direct service providers identified as their priority needs, e.g., individual counseling, individual management, coping with stress, motivation techniques and problem solving. Based on sheer numbers of individuals (administrators and direct service providers) identifying these as professional areas of need, this latter list would appear to warrant serious consideration for future inservice directions in the area of behavior impairment.

2. In terms of desirable formats, it is recommended that inservice providers consider the following top seven choices of administrators: conferences and workshops, visitations, problem solving sessions, "hands on" experiences, salary credit, observations and staff/peer support. Since all of these alternatives are also format preferences of teachers, they warrant attention, if solely on the basis of the strength of the numbers selecting these formats.

Professional Development Needs Survey
for Serving
Behaviorally Impaired Students.

Office use
Card 1
I.D. _____

Please complete and return as soon as possible to: 204 Barkley Memorial Center, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE 68583-0775.

Please include additional comments on separate sheet if you wish.

Section 1

Instructions:

Please rate each content/skill area listed below by circling one number in each of the two columns with regard to:

Column A. From your perceptions, what needs do you feel your BI & Resource teachers have for assistance in this area from 1 = low priority (no need) to 5 = highest priority (extremely high need).

Column B. From your perceptions, what amount of assistance in this area would be most beneficial to your BI & Resource teachers. Choose from these options, use only one for each.

1. one time contact with assistance
2. multiple contacts

Content/Skill	A. Need for assistance					B. Amount of assistance needed	
	low priority				high pricrity	one time	multiple contacts
01. Problem solving strategies in education.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
02. Program entry/exit decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
03. Techniques for motivating/rewarding students.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
04. Individual Education Program (IEPs) Development.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
05. Parent Involvement.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
06. Vocational preparation/career education.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
07. Social skills/affective education.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
08. Individual behavior management strategies (e.g., positive reinforcement, time-out, contracts, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
09. Individual counseling strategies (e.g., reality therapy, life space interviews, transact[illegible] analysis, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
10. Group management/classroom management strategies (e.g., classroom meetings, cooperative learning, grouping of students, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
11. Environmental management (e.g., seating arrangements, scheduling, task analysis & organization, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
12. Strategies for coping with job related stress.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
13. Consultation/collaboration with other educators.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
14. Flexibility/adaptability/patience in teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
15. Discipline, suspension and expulsion.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
16. Strong self concept and confidence as a teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
17. Integrating/mainstreaming students.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
18. Ability to sense and use humor in school situation.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
19. Roles and functions of various agencies & programs (e.g., corrections, welfare, mental health, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
20. Accessing residential treatment alternatives.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
21. Empathy/warmth/enjoyment in relationships with students.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
22. Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5	1	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I.D. _____

Section 2

Please rate on a scale of 1 = lowest to 5 = highest each of the following activities for professional growth regarding their:

A. desirability as a format for your BI & Resource teachers participation in professional growth.
B. effectiveness in general as a format for your BI & Resource teachers professional growth.

Type of Format	A. Desirability (lowest 1 2 3 4 5 highest)	B. Effectiveness (lowest 1 2 3 4 5 highest)
01. Observations of other teachers	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
02. Visitation to other schools	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
03. Weekend offerings	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
04. "Hands on" practicum	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
05. Video tapes and critique	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
06. Conferences and Workshops	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
07. Inservice with (salary) credit	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
08. College credit	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
09. Teacher/children exchanges	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
10. Panel discussions	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
11. Summer seminars	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
12. Regional study groups	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
13. Release time	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
14. Problem solving sessions	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
15. Staff & peer support systems	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
16. Supervisory support	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
17. "Make and Take" sessions	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
18. Brown bag sessions	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
19. Early bird sessions	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
20. Personal contracts for improvement	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Section 3

1. Circle the number of the one which best describes your role:

1. principal 2. director of special education 3. other (specify)_____

2. Number of inservices attended in the past year related to behaviorally Impaired.

By BI Teachers	Were they satisfied?	By Resource Teachers	Were they satisfied?	By Administrators	Were they satisfied?
_____	yes no	_____	yes no	_____	yes no

3. Which of the content/skill areas listed on the front page of the survey do you feel you as an administrator, need assistance in order to better serve Behaviorally Impaired students. Please limit your response to the top three areas.

1. Most important content area number: _____ Other: _____
2. 2nd most important content area number: _____
3. 3rd most important content area number: _____

4. Which of the potential types of formats for continued professional development in Section 2 on the second page, are most desirable to you for your professional development. Please limit your response to the top three formats.

1. Most desirable format number: _____ Other: _____
2. 2nd most desirable format number: _____
3. 3rd most desirable format number: _____

Thank you for your cooperation. Please return as soon as possible to:

The Support System Project for Behaviorally Impaired
The University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Special Education Department
104 Barkley Memorial Center
Lincoln, NE 68583-0775

BEST COPY AVAILABLE